DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 200 IR 007 474

AUTHOR Boisvert, Marianne
TITLE An Evaluation of "Choice" as a Selection Tool in the Field of Western History.
PUB DATE Aug 77
NOTE 40p.; Research paper submitted to the School of Library and Information Sciences, Brigham Young University

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *American History; *Book Reviews; *Comparative Analysis; Cost Effectiveness; Efficiency; Librarians; Library Material Selection; *Scholarly Journals

ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken to determine the extent to which "Choice" provides librarians with an adequate evaluation of the best books in the field of western American history in a reasonable amount of time. To assess the overall coverage, the titles of all the books reviewed in "Western Historical Quarterly" from 1970 to 1974 were searched in "Choice"; to determine the length of time between the publication of a book and its review, 40 titles of important works published between 1965 and 1971 were selected from the "Harvard Guide to American History" and searched in four scholarly journals as well as "Choice." Findings indicated that, although "Choice" was not as comprehensive in its coverage as "Western Historical Quarterly," it was more complete in reviewing the important works. "Choice" also reviewed books sooner after publication than did the scholarly journals, and the quality of its reviews was comparable to that of the journals. Appendices include bibliographic citations for the titles used in the study, findings for each reviewing source arranged by reviewing criteria, and a list of references. (Author/CMV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED174200

AN EVALUATION OF CHOICE AS A SELECTION TOOL IN THE FIELD OF WESTERN HISTORY

by

Marianne Boisvert

A Research Paper

Submitted to The

School of Library and Information Sciences

Brigham Young University

Provo, Utah

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marianne Boisvert

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements of

L. I. S. 697

Instructor: Merle Lamson

August, 1977

IR007474

ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to determine the extent to which Choice is an efficient and effective selection aid in the field of Western history. A list was drawn up of the books reviewed in Western Historical Quarterly from 1970 to 1974. The titles were then searched in Choice to discover whether its coverage was comparable to that of a scholarly publication. Then, forty titles covering the years 1965 to 1971 were selected out of the Harvard Guide to American History as important works in this field. Reviews of these works were searched in Choice and in four scholarly historical journals (American Historical Review, Journal of American History, and Western Historical Quarterly) to determine the length of time involved in the publication of the review and its quality in terms of criteria noted in the literature of book reviewing and selection. Choice was then evaluated as to whether it brought recognized works to the attention of the librarian and the promptness and quality with which this was done.

The study showed that Choice was not as comprehensive in its coverage as Western Historical Quarterly, but it was more complete in reviewing the important works. On the average, Choice reviewed books sooner after their publication than did the scholarly journals. The quality of reviews in Choice was shown to be comparable to that of the scholarly journals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Professor Victor Purdy for all his help in defining, clarifying and making this study workable. I am also grateful to all those who lent their suggestions on how the study could be changed and improved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

Chapter

1. THE PROBLEM 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 1

DELIMITATIONS 2

2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE 4

3. ELEMENTS OF A QUALITY REVIEW 7

4. METHODOLOGY 9

MEASURING EFFICIENCY 10

Overall Coverage 10

Coverage of Important Works 10

MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS 11

5. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 13

EXTENT OF COVERAGE 13

Overall Coverage 13

Coverage of Important Works 13

WAITING PERIODS 14

QUALITY OF REVIEWS 15

Precis of the Book's Contents 15

Style or Quality of Writing 15

Quality of Research and Sources 16

Analysis of the Author's Objectives 16

Chapter Page

New Interpretations and Information 17

Comparison with Other Books 17

Information About the Author 18

Overall Ratings 18

6. CONCLUSIONS 20

EFFICIENCY 20

EFFECTIVENESS 21

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 23

APPENDIX A 24

APPENDIX B 28

SOURCES CONSULTED 32

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

One of the aims of libraries is to provide patrons with the best materials as soon as possible after they become available. This goal can best be accomplished with selection tools that provide good critical reviews quickly. In 1958, in a discussion of book reviews for library selection, Leroy C. Merritt stated that "promptness and authority apparently do not go hand in hand."[1] This implies that an authoritative book review takes time and that a quick review lacks quality. This study tested that statement as it applies to the selection of Western history books for college libraries.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

How efficient and effective is Choice as a selection aid in the field of Western history when compared to scholarly journals? This question involves two elements. The first, efficiency, was considered in the context of the extent of coverage of a field and the time that elapsed between the publication of a book and its reviews. Scholarly journals are notorious for the time lag involved

---

[1] LeRoy C. Merritt, "The Pattern of Modern Book Reviewing," Reviews in Library Book Selection (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1958), p. 7. Merritt was then a professor of librarianship at the University of California.

in the publication of book reviews but Choice has also been criticized because it lacks promptness.[2] The second factor, effectiveness, involved the quality of the book reviews. Often, reviews in library selection media lack evaluative and critical comments which are often the forte of the scholarly reviews.

The time factor involved in scholarly reviewing makes professional journals difficult to use as selection tools, especially if the emphasis in collection development is on the new and current information in a field. One writer has suggested that the primary value of the reviews in these journals is that they serve as a check on book selection, an after-the-fact review to determine if the important works have been selected and if the selection was justified.[3] This study helped to determine whether a librarian who uses Choice for selection really needs to use scholarly review sources for this time-consuming check on selection. If this journal can provide good critical coverage of important works within a few months of their publication, it can serve the same purposes as scholarly journals but more efficiently.

DELIMITATIONS

Choice reviews works in various disciplines, but this study focused only on its coverage of history. In particular, the history of the American West was chosen as a microcosm of the whole field.

---

[2]Robert N. Broadus, Selecting Materials for Libraries (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1973), p. 82.

[3]David Spiller, Book Selection (2d ed. rev.; London: Clive Bingley, 1974), p. 80.

No attempt was made in this study to determine the methods used by the two types of journals in assigning the task of reviewing, nor were the professional qualifications of the reviewers compared. Thus the emphasis was on content of the reviews and not on the editorial policies affecting them.[4]

Recent developments in the selection process include the increasing use of block buying, blanket orders and approval plans. These systems are most useful to university and large public libraries. Since Choice is aimed at the undergraduate college library, the effects of these new processes on selection were not considered.

---

[4]For an analysis of the editorial aspects of historical reviewing, see Louis A. Kenney, "Reviewing of Historical Books," Illinois Libraries, 41 (May, 1959), 355-361.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

A search of the literature yielded three studies related to the topic. In 1948, Victoria E. Hargrave, then librarian at MacMurray College for Women, studied the similarities and differences between reviews in scholarly journals of economics, political science and international relations and those of general sources such as New York Times Book Review and Saturday Review.[1] The analysis showed that there was very little difference in the quality of the two kinds of review sources. She concluded that it was not worthwhile in most cases to wait for the scholarly review when the general periodical could provide basically the same information more quickly.

This differed from the present study in two ways. First, it did not concern itself with the review media specially focused on library selection. Second, the study made no attempt to determine how each source compared as far as coverage was concerned, for the titles used in the study were chosen because they were treated in each type of periodical.

---

[1] Victoria E. Hargrave, "A Comparison of Reviews of Books in the Social Sciences in General and Scholarly Periodicals," Library Quarterly, 18 (July, 1948), 206-217.

As concerns Choice itself, a study by James Lehman attempted to determine who used this selection tool and with what effect.[2] He found that, out of a sample of 101 librarians, 35 percent used professional journals extensively, in addition to Choice, especially where the faculty were actively involved in the selection process. In reviewing some of the comments added by those who answered the questionnaire, a few stated that reviews in Choice were published late, especially in the field of history.

A study quite similar to the present one was undertaken in 1968 by Jay B. Clark of Trinity University.[3] He compared the quality and coverage of Choice in the field of history against both a scholarly journal, American Historical Review, and a library review medium, Library Journal. He found that Choice reviewed as many books as the scholarly journals but not necessarily the same books. He found general agreement about the books reviewed by both sources, with Choice often being more critical. On the average, reviews in Choice appeared four months before those in historical journals.

The present study did not assess the whole field of history but only Western American history. Clark conducted his study with the books reviewed in 1966, only two years after Choice began publication. The present study surveyed the years between 1965 and 1971. It did

---

[2]James O. Lehman, "Choice as a Selection Tool," Wilson Library Bulletin, 44 (May, 1970), 957-961. Lehman developed this study while participating in a sixth year program in library science at Kent State University, Ohio.

[3]Jay B. Clark, "Choice's Historical Reviews," Missouri Library Association Quarterly, 29 (March, 1968), 24-26.

not assess every review in each of the journals, but a group of forty titles. Clark's conclusions will be tested, in part, to determine whether they hold true for limited fields as well as general and whether his statistics as to the currency and quality of reviews are consistent over a six-year period. Unlike Clark's study, no comparison will be made with the general library media.

Chapter 3

ELEMENTS OF A QUALITY REVIEW

The criteria for a good book review were needed in order to judge the effectiveness of Choice in comparison with scholarly journals. Sources were consulted which outlined what historical book reviews should contain.[1] When these sources were compared, the majority of them agreed on seven basic points of review structure.

The good review should contain:

1. A precis of the book's contents.

2. A comment on the style or quality of writing.

3. A statement concerning the quality of the research, sources, or bibliography.

4. An analysis of the author's objectives and whether or not he accomplished them.

5. A comment on the new interpretation or information provided by the work.

6. A comparison of the book with other works on the same subject.

---

[1]Sources used in setting up these criteria were: George Norman Clark, "Historical Reviewing," Essays in History, ed. H. W. C. Davis (Freeport, N. Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1927), pp. 122-124; Fred C. Cole, "Book Reviews: An Editor's Point of View," Journal of Southern History, 13 (May, 1947), 268; John E. Drewry, Writing Book Reviews (Boston: The Writer, Inc., 1966), pp. 47-53; Denys Hay, "The Historical Periodical: Some Problems," History, 54 (June, 1969), 172; Savoie Lottinville, The Rhetoric of History (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976), pp. 172-174.

7. Information on the author and his qualifications.

With the criteria established, the researcher then sought literature dealing with the factors a librarian looks for in selecting history books. The considerations found to be important in selection included authority, accuracy of both facts and source citations, clear literary style, and new, valid interpretations of the facts.[2]

The elements of a good book review seem to be closely related to the characteristics librarians seek in selecting history books. Both are concerned with well-written, reliable works that make a significant contribution to the field of history. Thus, the reviewing criteria were judged to be adequate for the purposes of this study.

---

[2]The works on selection used in this study were: Robert N. Broadus, Selecting Materials for Libraries (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1973), pp. 178-181; Mary Duncan Carter, Wallace John Bonk, and Rose Mary Magrill, Building Library Collections (4th ed.; Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974), pp. 89-90; Francis K. W. Drury, Book Selection (Chicago: American Library Association, 1930), pp. 89-93.

Chapter 4

METHODOLOGY

Choice could be considered an efficient and effective selection tool if it provided the librarian with an adequate evaluation of the best books in a field, in this case Western American history, within a reasonable amount of time. To determine whether this function was performed, a group of forty titles was arbitrarily selected from the Harvard Guide to American History.[1] This source was used because it is a recognized, authoritative list of the important works for the study of American history. The selection of titles was limited to those published between 1965 and 1971. The first date marks the first full year of the publication of Choice. The Harvard Guide stated June 30, 1970, as a cut-off date for inclusion but allowed for later titles.[2] Thus, the terminal date for this sample is 1971, accounting for the exceptions in the guide. Eliminated from the list were books published during these years as revisions of earlier editions. All the general works on Western history suiting these criteria were included in the group. To supplement the list, a majority of the works dealing with specific aspects of Western history published during the years considered was also chosen for the study.

---

[1] Frank Freidel, ed., Harvard Guide to American History (rev. ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1974), chapter 13.

[2] Ibid., p. vi.

Three major historical journals, American Historical Review, Journal of American History and Western Historical Quarterly were chosen to represent the scholarly review media. These works were praised and recommended in Magazines for Libraries and were therefore likely to be included in a college library collection.[3]

MEASURING EFFICIENCY

Overall Coverage

To assess the coverage of Choice in comparison with an historical journal, all books for which reviews have appeared in Western Historical Quarterly from 1970 to 1974 were searched in Choice. On the assumption that the scholarly journal would represent the major works issued in those years, a percentage could then be calculated, reflecting the extent to which Choice made librarians aware of the books in a field.

Coverage of Important Works

Reviews of each of the forty titles from the Harvard Guide (see Appendix A) were searched in Choice and the scholarly journals to determine if and when they appeared. The percentage of the forty titles reviewed in each of the journals was determined to assess the coverage of this sample in Choice. The date of publication of each review was compared to an approximate date of publication of the book, which was found by searching for the titles in the "Weekly Record" section of Publisher's Weekly. By determining the time lag for each

---

[3]Bill Katz, Magazines for Libraries (2d ed.; New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1972), pp. 413, 415, 421.

review in each journal, an average waiting period for reviews in the journal could be found. Also computed was the time difference between when a certain review appeared in Choice and when the same book was reviewed in the other journals. Thus, a relative index of efficiency was created.

MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS

The content of each review was judged by analyzing it in accordance with the criteria set up in Chapter 3. The reviews were studied to determine to what extent the seven points were included. A comparison of the journals' reviews was made using a scale to quantify the quality of the reviews. Ratings were made on a scale of one to four. A value of one was assigned if the review did not contain the element considered. A value of two indicated that the review fulfilled the criteria to a very small degree. For example, when considering the quality of research and sources, if the review simply stated that the book was well-researched, the review would merit a two for that category. If the factor was briefly elaborated on and qualified, it was rated as adequate and given a three. An imaginary example would be, "Using many excellent primary and secondary sources, this well-documented work . . . ." When discussion of a factor was more focused and extensive, comprising a full sentence or more, it was rated four, excellent. Frequency of the four values for each journal in each category was computed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program.

This comparison indicated any patterns in reviewing style for each journal or if any one consistently lacked an aspect of good

reviewing. By a summation of the values received on the scale for each of the seven criteria, the journals were then evaluated as to the overall quality of the book review section to determine whether Choice could be considered as effective as the scholarly journals. A total value of seven to fourteen indicated that coverage of most of the factors was meager or non-existent. Fifteen to twenty-one was an adequate review. Twenty-two to twenty-eight indicated that many of the factors were considered more extensively.

On the basis of the data computed in this study, conclusions were made as to the role Choice can assume as a selection tool in the field of history.

Chapter 5

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

EXTENT OF COVERAGE

Overall Coverage

To get a broad view of Choice's coverage of Western history books, the journal was searched for reviews of all the books reviewed in Western Historical Quarterly from 1970 to 1974. The five volumes of Western Historical Quarterly yielded 316 books reviewed. Of these, only 155, or 49 percent, were reviewed in Choice also.

Coverage of Important Works

The group of forty books from the Harvard Guide represent recognized, important works. Of these forty, thirty-six, or 90 percent, were reviewed in one of the four journals under consideration in this study. Choice contained reviews for twenty-nine out of this group of forty, which is 72.5 percent. Adjusting the figures to consider only the thirty-six books for which any reviews were found, 80.6 percent were included in Choice.

The American Historical Quarterly and the Journal of American History both reviewed twenty-two out of the forty books (55 percent), but these were not necessarily the same books. The percentage of coverage was 61.1 percent when only the thirty-six reviewed books were considered.

Problems arise in comparing the coverage of Choice with Western Historical Quarterly, since the latter began publication in 1970. The review section considered books published in 1968 or later. To find the percentage of coverage in this journal, only the fifteen books in the sample published after 1968 were considered. Out of these fifteen, eight, or 53.3 percent, were reviewed in Western Historical Quarterly. Out of the fifteen books included, three were among those not reviewed in any journal. Eliminating these three, the adjusted percentage was 66.7 percent.

Although many books were reviewed by each of the journals, there is little consistency in the books chosen for review. Allowing for the problems in coverage presented by the publication date of Western Historical Quarterly, there is a possibility of fifteen reviews in common. Only four out of the fifteen (27 percent) were reviewed in all four journals.

WAITING PERIODS

The "Weekly Record" section of Publisher's Weekly gives bibliographic information for trade books as soon as possible after publication. This source was used to get an approximate date of publication for the books in the sample. This was then compared to the date of review in the four journals. Of the thirty-six books for which reviews could be found, four were not given notice of publication in Publisher's Weekly.

It was found that, on the average, Choice reviewed the books 5.88 months after publication. Similarly, American Historical Review

had a time lag of 7.84 months. Average for Journal of American History was 6.94 months and 8.2 months for Western Historical Quarterly.

On the average, American Historical Review reviewed a book 3.8 months after the same book was reviewed in Choice. The statistic for Journal of American History is 1.6 months. Reviews in Western Historical Quarterly were 4.75 months later than those in Choice.

QUALITY OF REVIEWS

Each review was rated as described in Chapter 4. A summary of the results follows. Actual figures and percentages for each of the journals is provided in Appendix B, arranged by reviewing criteria.

Precis of the Book's Contents

Each of the four journals included information on the contents of the books in the reviews. Choice was the only journal having a substantial amount of reviews (27.6 percent) rated as only adequate. On the whole, the other three journals were excellent in this regard.

Style or Quality of Writing

This factor was considerably more varied than the previous one. More than one-half of the reviews in Choice gave very little or no indication of the style of writing in the books reviewed. Only 20.7 percent of the reviews were rated as excellent on this point; 24.1 percent were considered adequate. American Historical Review showed similar results. Little or no consideration of writing style was given in 81.8 percent of the sample. Excellence was shown in four cases (18.2 percent). Out of the twenty-two reviews in the Journal of American History, one-half of them gave no information about writing

style. Very little indication of this factor was provided in 27.3 percent of the reviews. Only five reviews (21.7 percent) were rated as either adequate or excellent. Only one review in Western Historical Quarterly gave excellent coverage to the matter of writing style. The remaining seven reviews gave little or no information on this point.

Quality of Research and Sources

In historical writing, it is very important that adequate, reliable sources be used in gathering facts and making interpretations. A good review should alert a librarian as to whether a work is backed by scholarly research. Out of twenty-nine reviews in Choice, twenty-two (75.9 percent) gave little or adequate indication of the book's research quality. Extensive coverage of this factor was given in four reviews (13.8 percent). Both the Journal of American History and American Historical Review showed a relatively high percentage of reviews considered as excellent on this point, 45.5 percent and 40.9 percent respectively. One-half of the reviews in the Western Historical Quarterly gave no indication of the kind of research that had been done and only one review mentioned this aspect in depth.

Analysis of the Author's Objectives

All four review sources tended, in most cases, to ignore mention of what an author was trying to achieve through his work. No mention of this factor was made in any of the eight reviews considered in the Western Historical Quarterly. In both the Journal of American History and American Historical Review, over one-half of the reviews considered did not include information about the

author's objectives. But, out of the twenty-two reviews in each journal, six were rated as excellent in the Journal of American History on this point, five in the American Historical Review. Results in Choice were more varied. Slightly under one-half of the twenty-nine reviews, 48.3 percent, did not consider the author's objectives. Five did so to a small extent; six gave adequate coverage. Extensive discussion of objectives occurred in four of the reviews.

New Interpretations and Information

The contribution of new ideas to a field of knowledge is an important factor in considering a book for selection. Of the twenty-nine books reviewed in Choice, eleven did not mention new interpretations or information. Ten of the reviews (34.5 percent) did so adequately and five (17.2 percent) were more extensive in the consideration of this facet. American Historical Review had the highest percentage of excellent coverage in this area, 40.9 percent. But, 31.8 percent of the reviews did not mention new information at all. Seven reviews in the Journal of American History were rated as adequate in this category. The other fifteen reviews were distributed evenly between the three remaining rating values. Out of eight reviews in Western Historical Quarterly, four contained no information on new ideas. Of the remaining four reviews, two were classified as adequate, the other two included very little mention of this factor.

Comparison with Other Books

How a book measures up to others on the same subject is an important consideration. The study found that very few reviews compare

a book to related works. This seems to be especially true for the Journal of American History and American Historical Review. Of the reviews in Journal of American History, 77.3 percent did not make such a comparison. The figure for American Historical Review is 72.7 percent. One-half of the reviews considered in Western Historical Quarterly included slight mention of other books, usually just noting the author's surname. Three of the remaining four reviews made no mention of similar works. Out of the twenty-nine reviews in Choice, 44.8 percent did not compare the work to others. Nine reviews (31 percent) were quite extensive in their comparison and four more (13.8 percent) gave adequate coverage to the similarities and differences between books.

Information About the Author

One can make a reasonable judgment of an author's work by knowing what else he has produced and his qualifications and expertise. All four journals gave this aspect of reviewing minor coverage. In each case, over one-half of the reviews did not discuss the author. When he was discussed, it was most often just a brief mention of his present position.

Overall Ratings

When the scores for each category were added together, a total score for the review was computed. All the scores for each journal were averaged, thus providing an overall rating for the reviews in that source. Choice gained the highest overall rating, 16.6, with the Journal of American History close behind at 16.2. The average

total score for American Historical Review was 15.6; this figure was 14.1 for Western Historical Quarterly.

Chapter 6

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of Choice as a reviewing source. Choice was compared to the reviews in scholarly journals to assess its role as a library selection tool in the field of Western history.

EFFICIENCY

In measuring the efficiency of Choice, two factors were taken into consideration: the number of works in the field of Western history that were reviewed and the amount of time between publication of the book and its review. The study indicated that, when compared to the number of books reviewed in Western Historical Quarterly, Choice does not seem to be very comprehensive in its coverage of Western history, reviewing less than one-half of the books included in the former journal. Yet, when only the most noteworthy and important books in the field are considered, the evaluation of Choice changes considerably. None of the four journals reviewed every one of the forty works included in the sample from the Harvard Guide, but Choice provided coverage for more of them than did the scholarly journals. One can conclude, then, that although not thorough in its coverage, Choice made librarians aware of the works judged as important to a greater degree than did the scholarly journals.

Alerting selectors to the availability of a notable work is not enough, though. This must be done while the book is still new and its ideas still current. Of the four journals studied, Choice was, on the average, quicker to publish a review, although there were individual situations where this was not the case. One must take into consideration, though, that while Choice is published eleven times a year, the other journals are produced only four or five times in a year. Thus, Choice has greater opportunity to publish the review of an important work.

The fact remains that, on the whole, Choice has proved to be more efficient in reviewing a small group of important works concerned with Western history.

EFFECTIVENESS

In being quicker and more comprehensive, did Choice sacrifice quality in its reviews? Apparently not, or rather not any more than the scholarly publications did. Overall ratings show that Choice, Journal of American History and American Historical Review generally provided adequate reviews. Reviews in Western Historical Quarterly tended to lack critical comment and were thus rated slightly less than adequate.

The only factor of a good review to be generally included to a great extent in most reviews was a statement of the book's content. While this is an important aspect of reviewing, often much description was given at the expense of critical comment. This seemed to be the case with many of the reviews in Western Historical Quarterly. Only one factor seemed to be often ignored in Choice's reviewing, that of

information about the author. The same condition was evident with the other three journals also. In considering the style of writing and comparison with other similar books, Choice was superior to the other three journals in making mention of the factor, but, in the case of writing style, this mention is most often meager or only adequate. In the remaining three categories (quality of research, statement of the author's objectives and information on new interpretations) the evaluation of Choice was about the same as that of Journal of American History and American Historical Quarterly. As stated previously, good criticism often seemed lacking in reviews in Western Historical Quarterly, thus placing it behind the other journals when these factors are considered.

Although its reviews are not excellent, Choice was as good as, and often better than, the scholarly journals in presenting criticism of important works in Western history. As a selection tool for this field, Choice seemed to be of the same quality as the scholarly journal journals. In some cases, the quality of its reviews was slightly higher than that of the other journals. Significantly, while not providing coverage of all the works judged important in the field, Choice did review more of them than did the scholarly journals under consideration here.

Should the professional journals be consulted as a check on book selection? This study indicated that this is often unnecessary. The quality and often the content of the reviews was very similar, thus making this time-consuming check needless. While Choice has been shown to be a valuable selection tool, the fact remains that the professional journals do review many works not covered in that journal.

Thus, for anyone seriously collecting in a field of Western history, the professional journals should still be consulted to become aware of the more obscure new books.

This study has served to substantiate many of the conclusions made by Clark in his study of Choice, referred to on page five. Both have shown that Choice will review a book about four months before American Historical Review does. Clark found that Choice reviewed the same amount of books as the professional journals, but not necessarily the same books. Using a sample of only forty books, Choice was shown here to review more books than the scholarly journal, but again not the same books.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study surveyed only the limited field of Western American history. Further research must be done using other aspects of history to discover whether these results can be generalized to the whole field. The research was also constrained by the dates involved. It would be interesting to discover whether the pattern found has continued to this day, or if any changes in coverage or quality can be seen. Also useful would be a study that is similar in format but which evaluates Choice against the more general library review media such as Library Journal and Booklist. Thus having compared the two extremes in book reviewing, the value of Choice in the process of book selection can truly be put into proper perspective.

APPENDIX A

TITLES USED IN THE STUDY

APPENDIX A

TITLES USED IN THE STUDY

Alden, John R. Pioneer America. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.

American Heritage History of the Great West. New York: American Heritage, 1965.

Athearn, Robert G. Forts of the Upper Missouri. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Bannon, John F., ed. Spanish Borderlands Frontier. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Billington, Ray A. America's Frontier Heritage. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Bogue, Allan G., ed. The West of the American People. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1970.

Caughey, John W. American West: Frontier and Region. Los Angeles: Ward Ritchie Press, 1969.

Clark, John G., ed. Frontier Challenge. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1971.

Drago, Harry S. Great American Cattle Trails. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1965.

_____. Roads to Empire. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1968.

Durham, Philip and Everett L. Jones. Negro Cowboys. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1965.

Dykstra, Robert. Cattle Towns. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968.

Eblen, Jack E. First and Second U.S. Empires. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1968.

Ellis, David M., ed. The Frontier in American Development. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1969.

Farquhar, Francis P. History of the Sierra Nevada. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1965.

Faulk, Odie B. Land of Many Frontiers. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Fisher, Vardis and Opal L. Holmes. Gold Rushes and Mining Camps of the Early American West. Caldwell, Id.: Caxton Printers, 1968.

Fite, Gilbert C. The Farmers' Frontier, 1869-1900. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Frazer, Robert W. Forts of the West. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1965.

Goetzmann, William H. Exploration and Empire. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.

Hollon. W. Eugene. Great American Desert. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Hutchinson, C. Alan. Frontier Settlement in Mexican California. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.

Jones, Billy M. Health Seekers in the Southwest, 1817-1900. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967.

Kirsch, Robert R. and William S. Murphy. West of West. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1967.

Lewis, Marvin. Mining Frontier. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967.

Murray, Robert A. Military Posts on the Powder River. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.

Olivia, Leo E. Soldiers on the Santa Fe Trail. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967.

Ottoson, Howard W. Land and People in the Northern Plains Transition Area. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.

Paul, Rodman W. The Frontier and the American West. 1971 (No bibliographic information available)

Pomeroy, Earl S. The Pacific Slope. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.

Richmond, Robert W. and Robert W. Mardock, eds. Nation Moving West. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.

Ridge, Martin and Ray A. Billington. America's Frontier Story. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Russell, Carl P. Firearms, Traps and Tools of the Mountain Man. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.

Saum, Lewis O. The Fur Trader and the Indian. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1967.

Spence, Clark C., ed. The American West. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1966.

_____. Mining Engineers and the West. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.

Sunder, John E. The Fur Trade on the Upper Missouri. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1965.

Taylor, Philip A. M. Expectations Westward. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1966.

APPENDIX B

RESULTS ARRANGED BY REVIEWING CRITERIA

APPENDIX B

RESULTS ARRANGED BY REVIEWING CRITERIA

Precis of Book's Contents

	None	Very Little	Adequate	Excellent
Choice	0	3(10.3%)	8(27.6%)	18(62.1%)
American Historical Review	0	1(4.5%)	0	21(95.5%)
Journal of American History	0	0	2(9.1%)	20(90.9%)
Western Historical Quarterly	0	0	0	8(100%)

Style and Quality of Writing

Choice	7(24.1%)	9(31%)	7(24.1%)	6(20.7%)
American Historical Review	8(36.4%)	19(45.5%)	0	4(18.2%)
Journal of American History	11(50%)	6(27.3%)	3(13.6%)	2(9.1%)
Western Historical Quarterly	3(37.5%)	4(50%)	0	1(12.5%)

Quality of Research

	None	Very Little	Adequate	Excellent
Choice	3(10.3%)	10(34.5%)	12(41.4%)	4(13.8%)
American Historical Review	6(27.3%)	6(27.3%)	1(4.5%)	9(40.9%)
Journal of American History	6(27.3%)	2(9.1%)	4(18.2%)	10(45.5%)
Western Historical Quarterly	4(50%)	1(12.5%)	2(25%)	1(12.5%)

Author's Objectives

Choice	14(48.8%)	5(17.2%)	6(20.7%)	4(13.8%)
American Historical Review	15(68.2%)	1(4.5%)	1(4.5%)	5(22.7%)
Journal of American History	13(59.1%)	0	3(13.6%)	6(27.3%)
Western Historical Quarterly	8(100%)	0	0	0

New Interpretations

Choice	11(27.9%)	3(10.3%)	10(34.5%)	5(17.2%)
American Historical Review	7(31.8%)	3(13.6%)	3(13.6%)	9(40.9%)
Journal of American History	5(22.7%)	5(22.7%)	7(31.8%)	5(22.7%)
Western Historical Quarterly	4(50%)	2(25%)	2(25%)	0

Comparison with Other Books

	None	Very Little	Adequate	Excellent
Choice	13(44.8%)	3(10.3%)	4(13.8%)	9(31%)
American Historical Review	16(72.2%)	0	4(18.2%)	2(9.1%)
Journal of American History	17(77.3%)	0	2(9.1%)	3(13.6%)
Western Historical Quarterly	5(62.5%)	1(12.5%)	1(12.5%)	1(12.5%)

Information About the Author

Choice	19(65.5%)	5(17.2%)	4(13.8%)	1(3.4%)
American Historical Review	18(8.1.%)	3(13.6%)	1(4.5%)	0
Journal of American History	16(72.7%)	3(13.6%)	1(4.5%)	2(9.1%)
Western Historical Quarterly	5(62.5%)	1(12.5%)	1(12.5%)	1(12.5%)

SOURCES CONSULTED

SOURCES CONSULTED

A. BOOKS

American Historical Association. Annual Report for the Year 1912. Washington, 1914.

Broadus, Robert N. Selection Materials for Libraries, New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1973.

Carter, Mary Duncan, Wallace John Bonk, and Rose Mary Magrill. Building Library Collections. 4th ed. Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

Davis, H. W. C., ed. Essays in History. Freeport, N. Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1927.

Drewry, John E. Writing Book Reviews. Boston: The Writer, Inc., 1966.

Drury, Francis K. W. Book Selection. Chicago: American Library Association, 1930.

Freidel, Frank, ed. Harvard Guide to American History. Rev. ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1974.

Gard, Wayne. Book Reviewing. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1928.

Katz, Bill. Magazines for Libraries. 2d ed. New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1972.

Lottinville, Savoie. The Rhetoric of History. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976.

Merritt, LeRoy C., Martha Boaz, and Kenneth S. Tisdel. Reviews in Library Book Selection. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1958.

Spiller, David. Book Selection. 2d ed rev. London: Clive Bingley, 1974.

Wilson, Louis R., ed. The Practice of Book Selection. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940.

B. PERIODICALS

Baird, A. Craig. "What We Expect of a Book Review, from an Author's Point of View," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 37 (February, 1951), 81-86.

Caughey, John W. "Trends in Historical Criticism," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 40 (March, 1954), 619-628.

Clark, Jay B. "Choice's Historical Reviews," Missouri Library Association Quarterly, 29 (March, 1968), 24-26.

Cole, Fred C. "Book Reviews: An Editor's Point of View," Journal of Southern History, 13 (May, 1947), 264-274.

Dexter, Lewis A. "On Book Reviewing--and Similar Pedestrian Activities," American Behavioral Scientist, 9 (Dec. 1965/Jan. 1966), 7-9.

Hargrave, Victoria E. "A Comparison of Reviews of Books in the Social Sciences in General and in Scholarly Periodicals," Library Quarterly, 18 (July, 1948), 206-217.

Hay, Denys. "The Historical Periodical: Some Problems," History, 54, (June, 1969), 165-177.

Kenney, Louis A. "Reviewing of Historical Books," Illinois Libraries, 41 (May, 1959), 355-361.

Lehman, James O. "Choice as a Selection Tool," Wilson Library Bulletin, 44 (May, 1970), 957-961.